

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,785	02/22/2002	David J. Leidel	1301-1125	2977
32376	7590 07/27/2004		EXAMINER	
LAWRENCE R. YOUST			JENKINS, DANIEL J	
DANAMRAJ & YOUST, P.C. 5910 NORTH CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1450			1742	
DALLAS, TX 75206			DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				\ \				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	7.				
		10/080,785	LEIDEL ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Daniel J. Jenkins	1742					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on the cover :	sheet with the correspondence a	address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor or the province of the period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however cation. ays, a reply within the statutory mining period will apply and will expire SI by statute, cause the application to I	er, may a reply be timely filed num of thirty (30) days will be considered tim X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <i>21 April 2004</i> .						
2a) <u></u>		☐ This action is non-final	•					
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are v Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction ion Papers	withdrawn from considera						
9)[The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	□ accepted or b)□ obje	cted to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objectio	n to the drawing(s) be held ir	nabeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by			` '				
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been receiv cuments have been receiv he priority documents hav Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	ved. ved in Application No ve been received in this Nationa a)).	al Stage				
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Ir	terview Summary (PTO-413)					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC		aper No(s)/Mail Date otice of Informal Patent Application (P	TO-152)				
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/21/04</u> .		ther:	. 4 , 52,				

Art Unit: 1742

1. 10/000,700

1. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's Response of 4/21/04. The Examiner does not find Applicant's Remarks persuasive. In particular, the Examiner finds that Mravic and Reese are analogous art, that of heavy metal powder metallurgy, the art that one of ordinary skill in the art would find reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved (see <u>In re Wood</u>, 599 F.2d 1032, 202 USPQ 171, CCPA 1979).

Secondly, the claims do not read away from any "use" of a shaped charge liner as downhole perforating operations.

Thirdly, the Examiner finds that the Application of the bullet of Mravic, to not penetrate a steel backing, is not contradictory to the combination. Mravic is used for the teaching of using a range of W in order to taylor ballistic characteristics. One of ordinary skill could use this teaching, understanding that the range of W in Mravic. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of the reference may be bodily incorporated into the other to produce the claimed subject matter, but simply what the references make obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (see In Re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545, (CCPA 1969).

Lastly, Mravic et al. teaches the high density contituent to an upper limit of about 90%, which reads upon Applicant's claimed low end of range. Thus one practicing Applicant's invention could form a liner with 90% W, the same as Mravic et al. (The Examiner notes that this limitation is not present in all of Applicant's independent claims, which allow for lower W amounts.)

Art Unit: 1742

However, the Examiner does find that the teaching of Mravic et al. disclose the application of his disclosure to shaped charge liners (see last sentence of Abstract). The Examiner makes a new rejection based on Mravic et al. as a primary reference, and accordingly, does not make this rejection final.

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reese et al. '791 (Reese et al.) in view of Mravic et al. in view of Reese et al. '791 and Goetzel.

Mravic et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Mravic et al. disclose a shaped charged liner (last sentence of Abstract) formed by the method comprising:

providing a high density constituent of a material selected from a group comprising tungsten (col. 2, line 18);

providing a low density constituent (col. 2, lines 22-24);

mixing the high and low density constituents to form a mixture (col. 5, lines 60 to col. 6, line 23); and

forming the mixture into a shaped charge liner (see last sentence of Abstact).

Mravic et al. further disclose wherein the low density constituent comprises tin, zinc, iron, nickel, cobalt and copper (col. 2, lines 22-23).

....

Art Unit: 1742

Mravic et al. further disclose wherein the tungsten constituent is present from 70% to more than 90% (see Fig. 1).

Mravic et al. further disclose wherein the mixture comprises carbon (graphite) (col. 5, line 64).

Mravic et al. is silent as to the combination of the shaped charge liner with a houseing and explosive charge.

Reese et al. teaches that a shaped charge liner is used with a housing and explosive charge (col. 1, 23-47).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form the shaped charge liner in the combination with a housing and explosive as taught by Reese et al. in the invention of Mravic et al. in order to apply the shaped charge liner to such applications.

However, Mravic et al. in view of Reese et al. do not disclose adding oil to the mixture. Goetzel teaches that oil is an equivalent to graphite in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of adding lubricant to the mixture. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add oil in place of graphite in the invention of Mravic et al. as taught by Goetzel in order to provide lubrication.

However, Mravic et al. in view of Reese et al. do not disclose further disclose substituting molybdenum to the mixture. It is common knowledge in the prior art to substitute molybdenum for cobalt or nickel in the same field of endeavor, since the substitution is known in the art.

Art Unit: 1742

However, Mravic et al. in view of Reese et al. do not disclose substituting lead for tungsten.

Mravic et al. discloses tungsten and lead as equivalents, but selects tungsten in his invention for applications wherein lead is not a desirable contaminant.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to partially substitute lead for tungsten in applications where environmental concerns over lead use are not as important as the cost savings realized by the relative less cost of lead over tungsten.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Jenkins whose telephone number is 571-272-1242. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH6:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1242. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel J. Jenkins Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742